

GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATIONS AND RELATED QUESTIONS FOR THE SPACINGS PROCESS

GANE SAMB LO

ABSTRACT. All the available results on the approximation of the k -spacings process to Gaussian processes have only used one approach, that is the Shorack and Pyke's one. Here, it is shown that this approach cannot yield a rate better than $(N/\log \log N)^{-\frac{1}{4}} (\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}}$. Strong and weak bounds for that rate are specified both where k is fixed and where $k \rightarrow +\infty$. A Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem is given while Stute's result for the increments of the empirical process based on independent and indentially distributed random variables is extended to the spacings process. One of the Mason-Wellner-Shorack cases is also obtained.

Nota Bene. This paper was part of the PhD thesis, Cheikh Anta Diop University, 1991, not yet published in a peer-reviewed journal by August 2014.

1. INTRODUCTION

The non-overlapping uniform k -spacings are defined by

$$D_{i,n}^k = U_{ik,n} - U_{(i-1)k,n}, \quad 1 \leq i \leq \left\lfloor \frac{n+1}{k} \right\rfloor = N,$$

where $0 \equiv U_{0,n} \leq U_{1,n} \leq \dots \leq U_{n,n} \leq U_{n+1,n} \equiv 1$ are the order statistics of a sequence U_1, \dots, U_n of independent random variables (r.v.'s) uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$ and $[x]$ denotes the integer part of x . The study of these r.v.'s have received a great amount of attention in recent years (see [2], [5], [10] and [13]). Particularly the related empirical process

$$\beta_N(x) = N^{\frac{1}{2}} \{F_N(x) - H_k(x)\}, \quad 0 \leq x \leq +\infty,$$

where

$$F_N(x) = \# \{i, 1 \leq i \leq N, NkD_{i,n}^k \leq x\} / N$$

Key words and phrases. Key words. Spacings, empirical process, oscillation modulus, strong and weak approximation, order statistics, gamma distribution and function, law of the iterated logarithm.

and

$$H_k(x) = \int_0^x \frac{t^k e^{-t}}{(k-1)!} dt, \quad x \geq 0.$$

plays a fundamental role in many areas in statistics (see [5]). All its aspects are have described by various authors.

(i) For the convergence of statistics based on spacings, it is helpful to have a Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem for $F_N(\cdot)$. Such results for the overlapping case are available in [3].

(ii) The limiting law of the spacings statistics may follow from suitable approximations of β_N to Gaussian processes. It is clear that the better the rates of those approximations are the less restrictive the conditions on the underlying random variables (*r.v.*). Such approximations also yield Kolmogorov-Smirnov's tests.

(iii) Finally, the oscillation modulus of β_N has been studied in [7], where is established the weak behaviour of the oscillation moduli of β_N is equivalent to that of the empirical process based on a sequence of independent and indentially distributed (*i.i.d*) random variables.

Our aim is to give strong versions of weak characterizations of the oscillation moduli that we have already given in [7]. As to the approximation of β_n to Gaussian processes, we will show that the rate given in [7] is, in fact, a strong one. Our best achievement is that this rate is the best attainable for the approach used until now and we provide the corresponding bounds. With respect to [1] and [2], we do not let k fixed. We allow it to go to infinity. Finally we give the Glivenko-Cantelli Theorem for F_N with almost the same condition as in [3] for the overlapping case.

2. THE GAUSSIAN APPROXIMATION.

Approximations of β_N to Gaussian processes are available since [12]. The best rates among those already given are due to [1] and to [2]. Among other results, [2] proved the following theorem and corollary.

Theorem 1. . *There exists a probability space carrying a sequence U_1, U_2, \dots of independent r.v.'s uniformly distributed on $(0, 1)$ and a sequences of Gaussian processes $\{W_N(x), 0 \leq x \leq +\infty\}$, $N = 1, 2, \dots$ satisfying*

$$\forall N > 1, \mathbb{E}(W_N(x) W_N(y))$$

$$(2.1) \quad = \min(H_k(x), H_k(y)) - H_k(x) H_k(y) - k^{-1}xyH'_k(x) H'_k(y)$$

such that

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup (\log N)^{-\frac{3}{4}} N^{\frac{1}{4}} \sup_{0 \leq x \leq +\infty} |\beta_N(x) - W_N(x)| < +\infty, a.s.$$

whenever k is fixed. Here $H'_k(x) = dH_k(x)/dx$.

Remark 1. *From now on, we will say according to the wording of Theorem 1 at the place of There exist a probability space ... such that.*

Definition 1. *A Gaussian process whose covariance function is given by (2.1) will be called a Shorack process of parameter k or a k -Shorack process.*

Corollary 1. *According to wording of Theorem 1, we have*

$$N^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log N)^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\log \log N)^{-\frac{1}{4}} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\beta_N(x) - W_N(x)| = o_p(1), \text{ as } N \rightarrow +\infty.$$

This means that $a_N^o = (\log N)^{\frac{3}{4}} N^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ is a strong rate of convergence while $a_N = (\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2 \log \log N)^{\frac{1}{4}} N^{-\frac{1}{4}}$ is a weak one. In fact [1] has showed

Theorem 2. . *There exist another sequence of processes β_N^1 , $N = 1, 2, \dots$ and a sequence of k -Shorack processes W_N^1 , $N = 1, 2, \dots$ such that, for k fixed, the two following assertions hold :*

$$(i) \quad \beta_N^1 =^d \beta_N, \forall N \geq 1$$

$$(ii) \quad \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\beta_N^1(x) - W_N^1(x)| a.s. = o(a_N) \text{ as } N \rightarrow +\infty, a.s. .$$

All these results are based on representations of spacings by exponential r.v.'s. Namely, when $n + 1 = kN$,

$$\begin{aligned} \{D_{i,n}^k, 1 \leq i \leq N\} &=^d \left\{ \frac{\left(\sum_{j=(i-1)k}^{j=ik} E_j \right)}{S_{n+1}}, 1 \leq i \leq N \right\} \\ (2.2) \quad &=: \{Y_i/S_{n+1}, 1 \leq i \leq N\}, \end{aligned}$$

where E_1, E_2, \dots is a sequence of independent exponential rv's with mean one and whose partial sums are $S_n, n \geq 1$. If $\mu_N = \delta_n = S_{n+1}/Nk$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \{\beta_N(x), 0 \leq x < +\infty\} &=^d \left\{ N^{\frac{1}{2}} (\xi_N \mu_N(x) - H_k(x)) + o\left(N^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \right\} \\ (2.3) \quad &= \{\Lambda_N(x) + R_N(x), 0 \leq x < +\infty\} =: \{\beta_N^*(x), 0 \leq x < +\infty\}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\xi_N(\cdot)$ (resp. $\Lambda_N(\cdot)$) is the empirical distribution function (resp. empirical process) based on Y_1, \dots, Y_N . The cited results are derived from simultaneous approximations of Λ_N and R_N .

First, we establish that the best rate attainable through this approach is that of [1] even when $k \rightarrow +\infty$.

Theorem 3. According to the wording of Theorem 2, for any k satisfying

$$(L) \quad \exists \delta_0 < 0, \forall 0 < \delta < \delta_0, kN^{-\delta} \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } N \rightarrow +\infty,$$

we have

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup a_N^{-1} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\beta_N^*(x) - W_N^*(x)| \text{ a.s.} = \begin{cases} K(k) = \left(k^{k+\frac{1}{2}} e^{-k} / k! \right)^{\frac{1}{2}}, & (k \text{ fixed}) \\ K_0 = (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{4}}, & (k \rightarrow +\infty). \end{cases}$$

Our second result is an improvement of Theorem 1 of [2].

Theorem 4. . According to the wording of Theorem 1, we have for any k such that for some $\delta_0, 0 < \delta_0 < \frac{1}{4}, kN^{-\frac{1}{4}+\delta_0} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup a_N^{-1} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\beta_N(x) - W_N(x)| \leq \begin{cases} K(k), & (k \text{ fixed}) \\ K_0 & (k \rightarrow +\infty) \end{cases} \text{ a.s.},$$

Proof of Theorem 4. From (2.3), we have $\beta_N =^d \beta_N^*$ for all $N \geq 1$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned}\beta_N^*(x) &= \Lambda_N(x) + N^{\frac{1}{2}}(H_k(\mu_N x) - H_k(x)) - \{\Lambda_N(\mu_N x) - \Lambda_N(x)\} + o(N^{-\frac{1}{2}}) \\ &=: \Lambda_N(x) + R_{N1}(x) + R_{N2}(x) + R_{N3}(x).\end{aligned}$$

We shall proceed by steps, approximating each of the R_{Ni} 's.

Lemma 1. Let $N_p = [(1 + \rho)^p]$, $p > 0$, $p = 1, 2, \dots, \varepsilon > 0$ and

$$C_{N_p} = \bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| R_{N1}(x) - N^{\frac{1}{2}} x H'_k(x) (\mu_N - 1) \right| > \varepsilon a_N K(k)/4 \right\}.$$

Then if $k/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, $\sum_p \mathbb{P}(C_{N_p}) < +\infty$.

Proof of Lemma 1 Apply the mean value theorem twice and get
(2.4)

$$A_{N1} = R_{N1}(x) - N^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mu_N - 1) x H'_k(x) = N^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mu_N - 1)^2 x^2 H''_k(x_N),$$

Where $0 < |x_N/x| < \max(1, \mu_N)$. First, it may be easily seen that

$$(2.5) \quad \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \frac{x H'_k(x)}{k^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{k^{\frac{1}{2}+k} e^{-k}}{k!} = K(k)^2,$$

$$(2.6) \quad \lim_{k \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| x H'_k(x) / k^{\frac{1}{2}} \right| = K_0^2,$$

and

$$(2.7) \quad 0 < M = \sup_{k \geq 1} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| x^2 H''_k(x) / k \right| < +\infty.$$

Recall that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(2.8) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P}(\max(1, \mu_N) > 1 + \varepsilon) \leq \sum_N \mathbb{P}(|\mu_N| > 1 + \varepsilon) < +\infty,$$

by the strong law of large numbers (SLLN) and

$$(2.9) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \left(\frac{Nk}{2 \log \log nk} \right) |\mu_N - 1| > 1 + \varepsilon \right) < +\infty$$

by the law of the iterated logarithm (loglog-law). We show in the Appendix how to adapt the classical SLLN and loglog-law to these cases.

Now by (2.4), (2.5) and (2.6)

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.10) \quad & \mathbb{P}(C_{N_p}) \leq \sum_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \mathbb{P}(\max(1, \mu_N)^2 > 1 + \varepsilon) \\
& + \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} |\mu_N - 1|^2 \left(\frac{Nk}{2 \log \log Nk}\right) > ce_N\right),
\end{aligned}$$

with $c = \varepsilon K(k)^2 / 4M(1 + \varepsilon)$, $e_N = (\log \log N)^{\frac{1}{4}} N^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}} (2 \log \log Nk)^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. But $\log \log Nk = (\log N)(1 + o(1))$, $K(k)$ is bounded and thus $ce_N > (1 + \varepsilon)^2$ for large N . Thus we can apply (2.8) and (2.9) to (2.10) and this completes the proof.

Lemma 2. *Let $\varepsilon > 0$ and*

$$D_{N_p} = \left\{ \bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |R_{N2}(x)| > (1 + \varepsilon/4) a_N K(k) \right) \right\}, \quad p = 1, 2, \dots$$

Then for any $k = k(N)$ such that $k/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, $\sum_p p(D_{N_p}) < +\infty$.

Proof of Lemma 2 The mean value theorem implies

$$(2.11) \quad |H_k(\mu_N x) - H_k(x)| \leq |\mu_N - 1| K(k)^2 \max(1, \mu_N) k^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

By proceeding similarly to (2.10), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
(2.12) \quad & \mathbb{P}(D_{N_p}) \leq \sum_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \mathbb{P}(\max(1, \mu_N) > (1 + \varepsilon/4)^{1/3}) \\
& + \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \left\{ \sup_{|H_k(x) - H_k(y)| < c_N} |\Lambda_N(x) - \Lambda_N(y)| > (1 + \varepsilon/4) a_N K(k) \right\}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$(2.12) \quad = R_{N21} + R_{N22},$$

with $c_N = K(k)^2 k^{\frac{1}{2}} |\mu_N - 1| (1 + \varepsilon/4)^{1/3}$. Now,

$$(2.13) \quad R_{N22} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \left\{ |\mu_N - 1| > (1 + \varepsilon/4)^{1/3} \left(\frac{2 \log \log N}{Nk}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right\}\right)$$

$$+\mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1}\left\{\sup_{|H_k(x)-H_k(y)|\leq b_N}|\Lambda_N(x)-\Lambda_N(y)|>(1+\varepsilon/4)a_NK(k)\right\}\right),$$

where $b_N = \left(\frac{2\log\log N}{N}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}} K(k)^2 (1+\varepsilon/4)^{2/3}$. Let $\gamma_N(\cdot)$ be the empirical process based on U_1, \dots, U_N and P_{N_p} be the second term of the right member of the inequality (2.13). Thus (2.2) implies

$$(2.14) \quad P_{N_p} \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1}\left\{\sup_{0\leq u\leq 1-b_N}\frac{\gamma_N(u)-\gamma_N(u+b_N)}{(2b_N\log b_N^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}}>1+\varepsilon_1\right\}\right),$$

$1+\varepsilon_1 < (1+\varepsilon)^{2/3}$, where we have used the fact that $(2b_N\log b_N^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}/a_Nk(k) \rightarrow (1+\varepsilon)^{1/3}$ as $k/N \rightarrow 0$, as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Finally, from line 14, p.95 and line 23, p.98 in [13], we get $\sum_p P_{N_p} < +\infty$. This and (2.11), (2.12), (2.13) and (2.14) together imply Lemma 2.

Lemma 3. (*Komlós, Májor, Tusnády, 1975*). *There exist a probability space carrying a sequence Y_1, Y_2, \dots as defined in (2.2) and a sequence of Brownian bridges*

$$B_N^1(s), 0 \leq s \leq 1, \quad N = 1, 2, \dots$$

such that

$$\forall N \geq N_1, \mathbb{P}\left(\sup_{0\leq x<+\infty}|\Lambda_N(x)-B_N^1(H_k(x))|>\frac{A\log N+x}{N^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right)\leq Be^{-\lambda x},$$

for all sequence $(k = k(N))_{N\geq 1}$ and for all x , where N_1, A, B and λ are absolute positive constants.

Proof of Lemma 3 This doesn't need to be proved. It is directly derived from [6] and Corollary 4.4.4 of [4].

Proof of Theorem 3 continued. On the probability space of Lemma 3, Lemmas 1 and 2 combined with the fact $R_{N3} \leq N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ imply that

$$(2.15) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P}\left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1}\sup_{0\leq x\leq +\infty}|\beta_N^*(x)-\beta_N^{**}(x)|>(1+3\varepsilon/4)a_NK(k)\right)<+\infty,$$

where $\beta_N^{**}(x) = \Lambda_N(x) - N^{\frac{1}{2}} \times H'_k(x)(\mu_N - 1)$, $0 \leq x < +\infty$. Hence, the proof will be complete if we approximate β_N^{**} in the right way. But by Lemma 3, for any $\varepsilon > 0$, for large N

$$(2.16) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\Lambda_N(x) - B_N^1(H_k(x))| > A_1 (\log N)^2 N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq N^{-1-\varepsilon},$$

where A_1 is some absolute constant. From Lemma 3.1 of [2]

$$(2.17) \quad \begin{aligned} N^{\frac{1}{2}}(\mu_N - 1) &= N^{\frac{1}{2}}k \frac{S_{n+1} - Nk}{Nk} + k^{-1} \int_0^{+\infty} \{\Lambda_N(x) - B_N^1(H_k(x))\} dx \\ &\quad + k^{-1} \int_0^{+\infty} B_N^1(H_k(x)) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Let $t_N = N^{\frac{1}{4}-\delta}$, $0 \leq \delta \leq \delta_0$. On the one hand, one has for large N .

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \int_0^{t_N} \{\Lambda_N(x) - B_N^1(x)\} dx \right| > \varepsilon a_N / 12 \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\Lambda_N(x) - B_N^1(H_k(x))| > \frac{\varepsilon (2 \log \log N)^{\frac{1}{4}} (\log N)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{12 N^{\frac{1}{4}-\delta}} \right) \\ &\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\Lambda_N(x) - B_N^1(H_k(x))| > A_1 \log N / N^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

This and (2.6) together imply

$$(2.18) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| x H'_k(x) k^{-1} \int_0^{t_N} \{\Lambda_N(t) - B_N^1(H_k(t))\} dt \right| > \varepsilon a_N K(k) / 12 \right) \leq N^{-1-\varepsilon},$$

for N large enough. On the other hand, as $N \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$(2.19) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| \int_{t_N}^{+\infty} \{\Lambda_N(t) - B_N^1(H_k(t))\} dt \right| > N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq N^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp \left(-N^{\frac{1}{4}-\delta} / 4 \right).$$

To see that, apply Markov's inequality with

$$\mathbb{E} \int_{t_N}^{+\infty} |\Lambda_N(x) - B_N^1(H_k(x))| dx \leq \int_{t_N}^{+\infty} 4k^{-1} e^{-x/2} \frac{x^{(k-1)/2}}{(k-1)!} dx \leq 4k^{-1} t_N^k \exp(-t_N/2).$$

Since $k = o(N^{\frac{1}{4}-\delta})$, as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, (2.19) follows. Finally for large N ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| x H'_k(x) / k^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{S_{Nk} - S_{n+1}}{(Nk)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \right| > \varepsilon a_N K(k) / 16 \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P} \left(S_k > N^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) = 1 - H_k \left(N^{\frac{1}{2}} k^{\frac{1}{2}} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Integrating by parts we have : $k/x \leq \frac{1}{2} \Rightarrow 1 - H_k(x) \leq 2x^{k-1}e^{-x}/(k-1)!$.

Then if $k/N \leq \frac{1}{2}$ for large N , we get by Sterling's formula,

(2.20)

$$1 - H_k \left(k^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \leq \text{const.} \exp \left(-k^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 + (k/N)^{\frac{1}{2}} \log(k/N) \right) \right).$$

Thus,

$$(2.21) \quad \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} x H'_k(x/k) \left((S_{Nk} - S_{n+1}) / N^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) > \varepsilon a_N K(k) / 12 \right)$$

$$(2.22) \quad \leq \text{const.} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} k^{\frac{1}{2}} N^{\frac{1}{2}} \right),$$

ultimately as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ whenever $k/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Put together (2.16), (2.17), (2.18), (2.19) and (2.22) to get

$$(2.23) \quad \sum_N \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\beta_N^{**}(x) - W_N^{**}(x)| > \varepsilon a_N K(k) / 4 \right) < +\infty,$$

where $W_N^{**}(x) = B_N^1(H_k(x)) - xk^{-1}H'_k(x) \int_0^{+\infty} t dB_N^1(H_k(t))$, $x \geq 0$.

And combine (2.15) with (2.23) to have

(2.24)

$$\sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \left\{ \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\beta_N^*(x) - W_N^{**}(x)| > (1 + \varepsilon) a_N K(k) \right\} < +\infty \right).$$

This together with Lemma 4.4.4. of [4] completes the proof.

Proof. of Theorem 3. As in the proof of Theorem 4, the spacings are always defined on the probability space of Lemma 3. We shall study each of the R_{N_i} 's once again. First we put together (2.4), (2.5), (2.6) and (2.7) to get

(2.25)

$$\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left| R_{N1}(x) - N^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_n - 1) x H'_k(x) \right| = 0 \left(N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log \log N \right), \text{ a.s., as } N \rightarrow +\infty.$$

Now Lemma 2 says nothing else but

$$(2.26) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |R_{N2}(x)/a_N| \leq K(k) \text{ or } K_0, a.s.,$$

whenever k is fixed or $k \rightarrow +\infty$ while $k/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. And the proof will be completed through our fundamental Lemma which is the following. \square

Lemma 4. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3, we have*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |a_N^{-1} R_{N2}(x)| \geq K(k) \text{ or } K_0, a.s.,$$

according whether k is fixed or $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and satisfies (L).

Proof. of Lemma 4.

Let $\psi(x) = ((k-1)!)^{-1} x^k e^{-x}$, $x \geq 0$. By the mean value theorem,

$$|\psi(x) - \psi(k)| \leq h e^h k^{k-1} (1 - 1/k)^{k-1} ((k-1)!)^{-1}, \text{ if } |x - k| \leq h \leq 1.$$

By Sterling's formula we can find a constant $\tau > 0$ such that

$$(2.27) \quad \sup_{|x-k| \leq h \leq 1} k^{\frac{1}{2}} |\psi(x) - \psi(k)| \leq \tau h k^{-1}, \text{ for all } k \geq 1.$$

Now,

$$(2.28) \quad A_N(x) = H_k(\delta_n x) - H_k(x) = (\delta_n - 1) \psi(x_n) (x_n/x), 0 \leq x_n/x \leq \max(1, \delta_n).$$

If $|x - k| \leq h \leq 1$, $|x_n - k| \leq k + (k+h)|1 - \delta_n|$, and thus by (2.27),

$$|x - k| \leq h \leq 1 \Rightarrow A_N(x) = (1 + o(1)) k^{\frac{1}{2}} (\delta_n - 1)$$

$$\times \{K(k) + 0(\{h + (h+k)|1 - \delta_n|\}/k)\}, a.s.$$

Let $h = h(N) \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Then by the loglog-law, there exists $\Omega^1 \subset \Omega$ and a sequence $(N_{j(\omega)})$ extracted from (N) (let n_j and k_j be the corresponding subsequences) satisfying

$$\mathbb{P}(\Omega^1) = 1, \forall \omega \in \Omega^1, A_{N_j}(x) = ((2 \log \log n_j)/N_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} K(k_j)^{\frac{1}{2}} (1 + o(1))$$

$$(2.29) \quad =: (1 + o(1)) d_{N_j},$$

uniformly in x , $k_j - h_j \leq x \leq k_j + h_j$, where $h_j = h(N_j)$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus we have uniformly un $x \in [k_j - h_j, k_j + h_j] = I_k$,

$$(2.30) \quad \left| R_{N_{j^2}}(x) \right| d = \left| \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j}(1 + o(1)) - \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x))) \right| =: \left| R_{N_{j^2}}^*(x) \right|.$$

We now prove that

$$(2.31) \quad \exists \Omega \subset \Omega^1, \mathbb{P}(\Omega_0) = 1, \forall \omega \in \Omega_0, \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \inf \sup_{x \in I_{k_j}} \left\{ \left| R_{N_{j^2}}^*(x) / b(d_{N_j}) \right| \right\} \geq 1,$$

where $b(s) = (2s \log \log s^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $0 < s < 1$.

Proof of (2.31).

Let

$$C_{N_1}(p) = \sup_{0 \leq v \leq d_N/p} \sup_{0 \leq s \leq 1-v} |\gamma_N(s) - \gamma_N(s+v)| / b(d_N), \quad p \geq 1.$$

By Theorem 0.2 of [13],

$$(2.32) \quad \forall p \geq 1, \exists \Omega_p \subset \Omega, P(\Omega_p) = 1, \forall \omega \in \Omega_p, \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup C_{N_1}(p)(\omega) < p^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Let

$$\Omega = \Omega^1 \bigcap \bigcup_{p=1}^{p=+\infty} \Omega_p.$$

Obviously $\mathbb{P}(\Omega^2) = 1$. And for any $\omega \in \Omega^2$, $C_{N_{j^2}}(\omega) =$

$$\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j}(1 + o(1)) - \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j})) = o(b(d_{N_j})),$$

This, together with the following, as $j \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$(2.33) \quad \forall x \in I_{k_j}, R_{N_{j^2}}^*(x) = \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j}) - \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x)) + \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j}(1 + o(1))) - \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j}),$$

implies that

$$\sup_{x \in I_{k_j}} R_{N_{j^2}}^*(x) \geq \sup_{x \in I_{k_j}} \gamma_{N_j}(H_{k_j}(x) + d_{N_j}) - \gamma_{H_j}(H_{k_j}(x)) + o(b(d_{N_j}))$$

$$(2.34) \quad \geq: C_{N_{j^3}}(h(N_j)) + o(b(d_{N_j})).$$

Now put $J_k = H_k(I_k)$ and remark that the lenght of J_k is $\rho(J_k) = 2K(k)^2 nk^{-\frac{1}{2}}(1 + o(1))$.

For any $p \geq 1$, choose $h = h(N, p) = h_p$ (with $h_{j,p} = h(N_j, p)$ such that $2K(k)^2 h_p k^{-\frac{1}{2}} d_N^{-1/4p} = 1 + o(1)$, as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus, $h \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ when (L) holds. Also $m_N = \max\{i, i \geq 0, H_k(k - h_p) + id_N \in J_k\} \rightarrow +\infty$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Therefore we may use the lines of the proof of Lemma 2.9 of [13] to conclude that for any $p \geq 1$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(D_N) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{1 \leq i \leq m_N} \{\gamma_N(C_{i+1}^N) - \gamma_N(C_i^N)\} / b(d_N) \leq (1 - 1/p)^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \\ &= 0 \left(N^{\frac{1}{2}} \exp\left(-m_N d_N^{1-1/2p}\right) \right), \end{aligned}$$

as $N \rightarrow +\infty$, where $C_i^N = H_k(k - h_p) + id_N$, $i = 1, \dots, m_N$. But $m_N d_N = \left(2K(k)^2 h_p k^{-\frac{1}{2}} x d_N^{-1/4p}\right) d_N^{1/4p} = d_N^{1/4p} (1 + o(1))$. Hence $\mathbb{P}(D_N) = 0 \left(d_N^{-1/8p}\right)$ for large N. Thus $\sum_N \mathbb{P}(D_N) < +\infty$, that is

$$(2.35) \quad \forall p \geq 1, \exists \Omega'_p, \mathbb{P}(\Omega'_p) = 1, \forall \omega \in \Omega'_p, \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \inf C_{N3}(h_p) / b(d_N) \geq (1 - 1/p)^{\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Letting

$$\Omega'_0 = \Omega^2 \bigcup_{p=1}^{p=+\infty},$$

we get $\mathbb{P}(\Omega'_0) = 1$ and for all $\omega \in \Omega'_0$,

$$(2.36) \quad \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \inf \sup_{x \in I_{j_k}} |R_{N_{j^2}}^*(x)| / b(d_N) \geq 1.$$

We have used in (2.30) that representation for commodity reasons as it has appeared in the proof. The same may be done, step by step, following Stute's results (see [13]) to get the version of (2.36) for $R_{N_{j^2}}$ itself. This remark completes the proof of (2.31). \square

Proof. of Lemma 4 (Continued). Remark that

$$\begin{aligned} (2.37) \quad & \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |R_{N2}(x)| / b(d_N) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \sup \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} \left\{ |R_{N_{j^2}}(x)| / b(d_{N_j}) \right\} \\ & \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \inf \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} R_{N_{j^2}}(x) / b(d_{N_j}) \geq \lim_{j \rightarrow +\infty} \inf \sup_{x \in I_k} R_{N_{j^2}}(x) / b(d_{N_j}). \end{aligned}$$

This combined with (2.31) and with the fact that $b(d_N) = K(k) a_N (1 + o(1))$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ proves the Lemma 4. \square

Conclusion 1. *It is clear by Theorem 3. that the approach used until now cannot yield a rate better than a_N . The problem is now : what new approach would be used to reach, if possible, the very best rate, that of [6] which is $N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \log N$.*

3. THE GLIVENKO-CANTELLI THEOREM

For the overlapping case, [3] obtained a Glivenko-Cantelli theorem when the step satisfies $kN^{-1+a} \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ for some $0 < a < 1$. As to the overlapping case only fixed steps have been handled in [2]. We give the general result in

Theorem 5. . *Let $k \geq 1$ be fixed or $k \rightarrow +\infty$ while $k/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Then*

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |F_N(x) - H_k(x)| = 0, a.s.$$

on the probability space where the spacings are defined.

Proof. of Theorem 5. We have

$$\forall N \geq 1, \{F_N(x) - H_k(x), 0 \leq x < +\infty\}$$

$$(3.1) \quad =^d \left\{ \xi_N(x) - H_k(x) + R_{N4}(x) + N^{-\frac{1}{2}} R_{N2}(x) + o\left(N^{-\frac{1}{2}}\right), 0 \leq x < +\infty \right\}.$$

First, it follows from Lemma 2 that for all $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$\sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} N^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |R_{N2}(x)| > \varepsilon/4 \right) < +\infty.$$

Next,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |R_{N4}(x)| > \varepsilon/4 \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(|1 - \mu_N| k^{\frac{1}{2}} K(k)^2 > \varepsilon/4 \right).$$

And direct calculations imply that for all $\lambda > 1$, we have

$$\mathbb{P} \left(|1 - \mu_N| k^{\frac{1}{2}} K(k)^2 > \varepsilon/4 \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(|1 - \mu_N| \left(\frac{Nk}{2 \log \log Nk} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} > \lambda \right)$$

for large N . Thus by (2.9)

$$\sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |R_{N_4}(x)| > \varepsilon/4 \right) < +\infty$$

whenever $k/N \rightarrow 0$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Finally,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq x < +\infty} |\xi_N(x) - H_k(x)| > N^{-\frac{1}{4}} \right) &= \mathbb{P} \left(\sup_{0 \leq s < 1} N^{-\frac{1}{2}} |\gamma_N(s)| > N^{-\frac{1}{4}} \right) \\ &\leq 2N \max_{0 \leq i \leq N} \mathbb{P} \left(U_{i,N} - \frac{i}{N} > N^{-\frac{1}{4}} - N^{-1} \right) = J_N, \end{aligned}$$

by the fact that $\gamma_N(\cdot)$ has stationary increments. Using now a representation of γ_N by a Poisson process and an approximation of a Poisson distribution by a Gaussian one (see Lemmas 2.7 and 2.9 in [13]) to get for large N that

$$J_N \leq \text{const. } N^{3/2} \mathbb{P} \left(N(0,1) > N^{-\frac{1}{4}} \text{const.} \right) \leq \text{const. } N^{5/4} \exp(-N^{1/8}).$$

Thus $\sum_N J_N < +\infty$. And the proof of Theorem 5 is now complete. \square

4. THE OSCILLATION MODULI

The oscillation modulus of a function $R(s)$, $0 \leq s < 1$, is defined by

$$\kappa(d, R) = \sup_{0 \leq h \leq d} \sup_{0 \leq s < 1-h} |R(s+h) - R(s)|, \quad 0 < d < 1.$$

That of the empirical process pertaining to *iid* rv 's has been studied for several choices of d in [9] and [13]. It is remarkable that the weak versions of all those results are inherited by the reduced spacings process $\alpha_N(s) = \beta_N(H_k^{-1}(s))$, $0 \leq s < 1$, (see [7]). For the strong case, we obtain these two results.

Theorem 6. *I. The Stute's case.*

If $(d_N)_{N \geq 1}$ is a sequence of non-increasing positive reals such that

$$(S1) \quad Nd_N \rightarrow +\infty,$$

$$(S2) \quad (\log d_N^{-1}) / (Nd_N) \rightarrow 0,$$

$$(S3) \quad (\log d_n^{-1}) / \log \log N \rightarrow +\infty,$$

$$(S4) \quad (2d_N \log d_N^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}} / a_N =: q_N / a_N \rightarrow +\infty, \text{ as } N \rightarrow +\infty,$$

then for $k \geq 1$ fixed or $k = k(N) \rightarrow +\infty$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ and satisfying

$$(4.1) \quad \exists N_o, \delta > 2, \forall N \geq N_o, 0 < d_N < k^{k(\delta-2)} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}k^\delta\right).$$

we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup \kappa(d_N, \alpha_N) / q_N = 1$ a.s.

II. A Mason-Wellner-Shorack case.

Let $a_N = \alpha (\log N)^{-c}$, $\alpha > 0, c > 0$. Then under the same assumptions on k used in Part I, we have $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup \kappa(d_N, \alpha_N) / q_N \leq (1+c)^{\frac{1}{2}}$, a.s.

Proof of Part I of Theorem 6. We have by Lemmas 1 and 2,

$$\forall N \geq 1, \{\alpha_N(s), 0 \leq s < 1\} d = \{\Lambda_N(H_k^{-1}(s)) + R_{N5}(s) + R_{N6}(s), 0 \leq s < 1\}$$

$$(4.2) \quad =: \{\bar{\alpha}_N(s), 0 \leq s < 1\},$$

with

$$R_{N5}(s) = N^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu_N - 1) H_k^{-1}(s) H'_k(H_k^{-1}(s)) =: N^{\frac{1}{2}} (\mu_N - 1) \phi(s), 0 \leq s < 1,$$

and

$$(4.3) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \sup_{0 \leq s < 1} |R_{N6}(s)| > (1+\varepsilon) a_N K(k) \right) < +\infty,$$

by (4.3) and (S4), we have

$$(4.4) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \kappa(d_N, R_{N6}) > \varepsilon q_N / 3 \right) < +\infty.$$

By Lemma A4 in [7], $\kappa(d_N, \phi) = (1 + o(1)) q_N^2$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$ for all k satisfying (S5). Thus, by the loglog-law,

$$\sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \kappa(d_N, R_{N5}) > \varepsilon q_N / 3 \right) < +\infty,$$

whenever

$$(4.5) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} k^{-1} d_N \log \log (1/d_N) \log \log Nk = 0$$

is satisfied. This obviously follows from (S1), (S2), (S3), (S4) and (S5). By the results of [13] as recalled in (2.14), for $\varepsilon > 0$,

$$(4.6) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \kappa(d_N, \Lambda_N(H_k^{-1})) > (1 + \varepsilon/3) q_N \right) < +\infty,$$

when (S1), (S2) and (S3) hold. Since ε is arbitrary and since (S1) and (S3) imply (4.5), we get

$$(4.7) \quad \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \sup q_N^{-1} \kappa(d_N, \alpha_N) \leq 1, a.s.$$

To get the other inequality, define for $0 < c_1 < c_2 < +\infty, 0 < d < 1$, for any function $R(s), 0 \leq s < 1$,

$$(4.8) \quad \kappa'(d, R) = \sup_{c_1 d < u-t < c_2 d} |R(u) - R(t)| / \sqrt{u-t}, 0 \leq u, t \leq 1.$$

Let $R_N(.) = R_{N5}(.) + R_{N6}(.)$ and $r_N(.) = \Lambda_N(H_k^{-1}(.))$. Now remark that for all $\varepsilon_1 > 0$, there exists $\varepsilon_2 > 0$ such that for

$$a = ((1 - \varepsilon_1) \log d_N^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$b = (\varepsilon_2 \log d_N^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

$$a+b = \left((1 - \varepsilon_1 + \varepsilon_2 + 2(\varepsilon_2(1 - \varepsilon_1))^{\frac{1}{2}}) \log d_N^{-1} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} = ((1 - \varepsilon_3) \log d_N^{-1})^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

with $\varepsilon_3 > 0, \varepsilon_3, \varepsilon_2 \rightarrow 0$ as $\varepsilon_1 \rightarrow 0$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\kappa'(d_N, \alpha_N) \leq a) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\{\kappa'(d_N, \bar{\alpha}_N) \leq a\} \cup \{\kappa'(d_N, R_N) > b\}) \\ &\quad + \mathbb{P}(\{\kappa'(d_N, \bar{\alpha}_N) \leq a\} \prod \{\kappa'(d_N, R_N) \leq b\}) \end{aligned}$$

$$(4.9) \quad \leq \mathbb{P}(\kappa'(d_N, R_N) > b) + \mathbb{P}(\kappa'(d_N, r_N) \leq a+b),$$

By (4.3) and (4.4)

$$(4.10) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \kappa'(d_N, R_N) > b \right) < +\infty,$$

for all $\varepsilon_2 > 0$. Thus by (4.2), (4.8), (4.9) and (4.10) and Lemma 2.9 of [13] and some straightforward considerations, we get $\lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \inf \kappa'(d_N, \alpha_N) \geq 1$, *a.s.*, under (S1), (S2), (S3) and (S4). Letting $c_1 = c_2 = 1$,

$$(4.11) \quad \liminf_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \kappa(d_N, \alpha_N) \geq \lim_{N \rightarrow +\infty} \inf \kappa'(d_N, \alpha_N) \geq 1, \text{ a.s.}$$

(4.7) and (4.11) together complete the proof of Part I of Theorem 6.

Proof of Part II of Theorem 6.

Here (S3) and (S4) are satisfied. It suffices thus to write again the proof of the part one where one should use the probability inequality (2.4) of [9]. It must be noticed that Part III of Theorem 1 in [9] holds for the general case where $a_N = \alpha (\log_N)^{-c}$, $0 < \alpha, 0 < c$.

APPENDIX. PROOFS OF STATEMENTS (2.8) AND (2.9)

a) Proof of Statement (2.8).

Tchebychev's inequality yields $\alpha > 1$ and $\beta > 1$ such that $\mathbb{P}(S_n 2/n^2 > 1 + \varepsilon) \leq A_2 n^{-\alpha}$ and $\mathbb{P}(|S_n - S_{m(n)}| > n\varepsilon/2) \leq A_3 n^{-\beta}$ as $n \rightarrow +\infty$, where $m(n) = \max\{j^2, j^2 \leq n, j = 1, 2, \dots\}$. Thus

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mu_N - S_{n+1}/(n+1)| > \varepsilon/2) + \mathbb{P}(S_{n+1} \geq 1 + \varepsilon/2)$$

$$(4.12) \quad \leq \mathbb{P}(|\mu_N - S_{n+1}/(n+1)| > \varepsilon/2) + (A_2 + o(1))k^{-\alpha}N^{-\alpha} + (A_3 + o(1))k^{-\beta}N^{-\beta},$$

since $(n+1) \sim Nk$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Furthermore, by Tchebychev's inequality,

$$\mathbb{P}(S_{Nk}/Nk - (Nk)^2 > \varepsilon/8) \leq 64N^{-3}k^{-3}/\varepsilon^2$$

$$\mathbb{P}(S_k/(Nk)^2 - (Nk)^2 > \varepsilon/8) \leq 64N^{-4}k^{-3}/\varepsilon^2$$

and

$$\mathbb{P}(|\mu_N - S_{n+1}/(n+1)| \geq \varepsilon/2) \leq \mathbb{P}(S_{Nk}/Nk > \varepsilon/4) + \mathbb{P}(S_k/(Nk)^2 > \varepsilon/4).$$

Hence since $Nk \rightarrow +\infty$, $N^2k \rightarrow +\infty$ as $N \rightarrow +\infty$,

$$(4.13) \quad \sum_N \mathbb{P}(|\mu_N - S_{n+1}/n+1| > \varepsilon/2) < +\infty.$$

Thus (4.12) and (4.13) together imply (2.8).

Proof of (2.9).

We have

$$\frac{S_{n+1} - Nk}{(2Nk \log \log Nk)^{\frac{1}{2}}} = \frac{S_{n+1} - S_{Nk}}{(2Nk \log \log Nk)^{\frac{1}{2}}} + \frac{S_{n+1} - Nk}{(2Nk \log \log Nk)^{\frac{1}{2}}} =: S'_N + S''_N.$$

First, since $0 \leq (n+1) - Nk \leq k$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(S'_N > \varepsilon/2) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(S_k > \varepsilon(2Nk \log \log Nk)^{\frac{1}{2}}/2\right) \\ &\leq 1 - H_k\left(k^{\frac{1}{2}}N^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \leq \text{const.} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}k^{\frac{1}{2}}N^{\frac{1}{2}}\right) \end{aligned}$$

as $k/N \rightarrow 0$, $N \rightarrow +\infty$ (see Statement (2.20)). Thus

$$(4.14) \quad \sum_N \mathbb{P}(S'_N > \varepsilon/2) < +\infty.$$

Now, let

$$p = p(N) = \inf \{j, N > N_j\}$$

and

$$q(N) = \inf \left\{ j, k(N) > N_j = \left[(1 + \rho)^j \right], j = 1, 2, \dots \right\}$$

Then $N_{p-1} \leq N \leq N_p$, $N_{p-1}N_{q-1} \leq NK \leq N_pN_q$, $\log \log N_pN_q = (\log \log N_p)(1 + o(1))$, as $N/k \rightarrow +\infty$, $N \rightarrow +\infty$, $N_{p+1}/N_p \rightarrow 1 + \rho$, as $N \rightarrow +\infty$. Thus (see [8], p.259-262).

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} \{S''_N \geq 1 + \varepsilon/2\} \right) &\leq A_4 \mathbb{P} \left(S_{N_pN_q} > 1 + \delta(\varepsilon, \rho) (2N_p \log \log N_p)^{\frac{1}{2}} \right) \\ &\leq A_5 p^{-(1+\delta(\varepsilon, \rho))} \end{aligned}$$

as $p \rightarrow +\infty$, for ρ small enough, $\delta(\varepsilon, \rho) > 0$. The same holds for $-S''_N$.

Thus

$$(4.15) \quad \sum_p \mathbb{P} \left(\bigcup_{N=N_p}^{N=N_{p+1}-1} (|S''_N| > 1 + \varepsilon/2) \right) < +\infty.$$

Finally (4.14) and (4.15) together imply (2.9).

REFERENCES

- [1] Aly, E.A.A. (1985). Strong approximation of empirical and quantile processes of uniform and exponential spacings. *Preprint*.
- [2] Aly, E.A.A., Beirlant, J. and Horváth, L. (1984). Strong and weak approximation of the k-spacings processes. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete*, 66, 461-488.
- [3] Beirlant, J. and Van Zuijlen, M.C.A. (1985). The empirical distribution function and strong laws of order statistics of uniform spacings. *J. Multiv. Analysis*, 16, 380-397.
- [4] Csörgö, M. and Révész, P. (1981). *Strong Approximations in Probability and Statistics*. Academic Press. New-York.
- [5] Deheuvels, P. (1984). Spacings and applications. *Techn. Report, 13, L.S.T.A., Université Paris VI*.
- [6] Komlós, J., Májor, P. and Tusnády, G. (1975). An approximation of the partial sums of independent rv's and the df. *Z. Wahrsch. verw. Gebiete*, 32, 111-131.
- [7] Lô, G.S. (1987). On the increments of the k-spacings process for fixed or moving steps. Submitted and now in revision.
- [8] Loève, M. (1963). *Probability Theory I*. Van Nostrand Comp. Inc. Princeton, 3rd Ed.
- [9] Mason, D.M., Shorack, G. and Wellner, J.A. (1983). Strong theorems for the oscillation moduli of the uniform empirical process. *Z. Wahrsch. Gebiete*, 65, 83-97.
- [10] Pyke, R. (1965). Spacings. *J. Roy. Statist. Ser. B*, 27, 359-449.
- [11] Pyke, R. (1972). Spacings revisited. *Proc. Sixth. Berkeley Sympos. Math. Statist. Probab.*, 417-427.
- [12] Shorack, G. (1972). Convergence of quantile and spacings processes with applications. *Ann. Math. Statist.*, 43, 1400-1411.
- [13] Stute, W. (1982). The oscillation behavior of empirical process. *Ann. Probab.*, 10, 1, 86-107.

RESEARCH ADDRESS. L.S.T.A., UNIVERSITÉ PARIS VI. T.45/55, E.3. 4, PLACE JUSSIEU, F-75230, PARIS CÉDEX 05. FRANCE.